

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Various claims are being amended as shown above. No new matter is being added by the amendment to the claims.

In the office action, claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, various abbreviations in claims 11 and 12 require an expansion. Accordingly, the terms PA-RISC™ and PA-IPF™ are being identified as shown in the above amendment to the claims.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

In the office action, claims 1-10, 13, and 15-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sundaram, et al. (US Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0055003 A1) in view of Bitar, et al. (US Pat. No. 5,872,963). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Sundaram is directed to a system where a pointer 133 points to a task stack 118 which is a memory location (Sundaram, paragraph 0037) that stores the task (thread) context information 151 for a thread. However, the task stack does not transfer a thread to an unblock upcall handler or other handlers. Bitar also does not disclose an unblock handler call stub that subsequently transfers a kernel thread to an unblock upcall handler which communicates with a scheduler in the user space, as

substantially recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the Sundaram-Bitar combination.

Independent claims 15 and 24 are being amended to recite the above similar features that are not disclosed and are not suggested by the Sundaram-Bitar combination. Accordingly, claims 15 and 24 are each patentable over the Sundaram-Bitar combination.

Claims 2-10, 13, 16-25, 26, and 27 depend from one of the claims 1, 15 and 24 and are each patentable over the combination of Sundaram and Bitar for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 15 and 24 are patentable over the cited references, considered singly or in combination. Furthermore, each of the claims 2-10, 13, 16-25, 26 and 27 distinguishes over the combination of Sundaram and Bitar by reciting additional features in combination with the features that recited of their respective base claims. Accordingly, claims 2-10, 13, 16-25, 26, and 27 are each patentable over the combination of Sundaram and Bitar.

For the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

In the office action, claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sundaram in view of Bitar, and further in view of Aries(5) Itanium Processor Family Only HP-UX 11i Version 1.6: June 2002. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Examiner correctly admits in the office action that Sundaram and Bitar do not teach the PA-RISC and PA-IPF architectures. In an attempt to overcome the deficiencies

of Sundaram and Bitar, the Examiner relies on Aries in an attempt to show various features.

However, claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 1 and are each patentable over the combination of Sundaram, Bitar, and Aries for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references, considered singly or in combination. Furthermore, each of the claims 11 and 12 distinguishes over the combination of Sundaram, Bitar, and Aries by reciting additional features in combination with the features recited in their respective base claim. Accordingly, claims 11 and 12 are each patentable over the combination of Sundaram, Bitar, and Aries.

For the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

In the office action, claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sundaram in view of Bitar, and further in view of Freund. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Examiner correctly admits in the office action that Sundaram and Bitar do not teach system call involving accessing an I/O device. In an attempt to overcome the deficiencies of Sundaram and Bitar, the Examiner relies on Freund in an attempt to show various features.

Claim 14 depend from claim 1 and are each patentable over the combination of Sundaram, Bitar, and Freund for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references, considered singly or in combination. Furthermore, claim 14 distinguishes over the combination of Sundaram, Bitar, and Freund by reciting additional features

in combination with the features recited in their respective base claim. Accordingly, claim 14 is patentable over the combination of Sundaram, Bitar and Freund.

For the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims.

If the undersigned attorney has overlooked a teaching in the cited reference that is relevant to the allowability of the claims, the Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically point out where such teachings may be found.

CONTACT INFORMATION

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (805) 681-5078.

Date: September 4, 2007


Respectfully submitted,



Arnold M. de Guzman  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 39,955  
805.681.5078  
805.681.5076 (FAX)

Please send correspondence to:

**IP Administration**  
**Legal Department, M/S 35**  
**HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY**  
**P.O. Box 272400**  
**Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400**

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence, including the enclosures identified herein, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below. If the Express Mail Mailing Number is filled in below, then this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.10.			
Signature:			
Typed or Printed Name:	Arnold M. de Guzman, Reg. No. 39,955	Dated:	September 4, 2007
Express Mail Mailing Number (optional):			